DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 568 PS 018 753

AUTHOR Si[illegible]l, Wendi Feldman
TITLE Fostering Prosocial Behavior in Preschool Children through Teacher, Student, and Parent Involvement.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 81p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Aggression; *Antisocial Behavior; *Behavior Change; Child Rearing; *Early Childhood Education; *Parent Attitudes; Parent Child Relationship; Parent Participation; Peer Relationship; Preschool Children; Preschool Education; *Prosocial Behavior

ABSTRACT

Ten preschool children who were not demonstrating age-appropriate, acceptable, social behavior in school were identified. A program was developed, the objectives of which were to decrease children's aggressive behavior and increase the frequency of social activity. The ten children attended three individual sessions with an adult in which they learned about prosocial solutions to everyday problems. The parents of these children were asked to complete a q-sort dealing with parental values. Parents also spent time with their children in school every week and received information on developmentally appropriate practices relating to social skills and on the priorities that other parents set for their children. Although each objective was not met for each child, positive results were generated by the project. (PCB)

PRACTICUM REPORT

Center for the Advancement of Education

Ed.D. Program

Fostering Prosocial Behavior in Preschool Children through Teacher, Student, and Parent Involvement

3301 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314
305/475-7300

NOVA UNIVERSITY

Fostering Prosocial Behavior in Preschool Children through Teacher, Student, and Parent Involvement

by

Wendi Feldman Siegel

090-42-0283

Cluster 30

A Practicum I Report presented to the Ed. D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

NOVA UNIVERSITY

1990

DISSERTATION APPROVAL SHEET

This dissertation was prepared as described.

Certified: Judy L. Farlin

Judy L. Farlin

ADMINISTRATOR

Title

4550 NORTH STATE RD 7, FT. LAUDERDALE, FL.

Address

February 10, 1990

This dissertation report was submitted by Verdi F. Riegel under the direction of the advisor listed below. It was submitted to the Ed. D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova University.

Approved:

April 10, 1990
Date of Final Approval of Report

Polly A. Peterson, Ph.D. Advisor

I gratefully acknowledge the contribution of a special group of people to the success of this report. In her role as adviser, Dr. Polly Peterson made the practicum process pleasurable, memorable, and meaningful. My cluster support group which consisted of Barry Birnbaum, Judy Marged, and Joyce Rubin lent encouragement every step of the way with the motto "stay with it." Most importantly, my husband David and my children Natalie and Tedd gave me the gift of patience, cooperation, and understanding when I needed it most.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

ABSTRACT

Fostering Prosocial Behavior in Preschool Children through Teach, Student, and Parent Involvement. Siegel, Wendi F., 1990: Practicum Report, Nova University, Ed. D. Program in Early and Middle Childhood. Descriptors: Preschool Education/Prosocial Behavior/Parent Involvement/Aggression

This practicum was designed to increase the prosocial behavior of aggressive preschool children. The goal was to improve the behavior of children found to be undersocialized by conducting remedial sessions with individual children, by raising the consciousness of their parents, and by encouraging their teachers to utilize methods to promote social skills in the classroom.

Through classroom observation and teacher inventories, the writer gathered information to identify a target group of children who were not demonstrating age-appropriate, acceptable, social behavior in the school. Further, a q-sort of parental values indicated that the parents of these children held somewhat different priorities for their children's school experience than the teachers and the parents of adequately socialized children of the same age.

At the outset, all teachers received materials which included suggestions to foster prosocial behavior in their classes. During the solution strategy, the parents of the children in the target group spent some time each week with their children in the school. Also at that time, parents received information on developmentally appropriate practices relating to social skills and the priorities parents set for their children. The children attended three individual sessions with the writer in which they learned about and analyzed prosocial solutions to everyday problems. In order to assess the stated objectives of the solution strategy, at the end of the implementation period, children in the target group were observed again in their classrooms and rated once more by their teachers. Parents were asked to complete the school priorities q-sort a second time.

The dissemination of information to parents and teachers had beneficial outcomes. Teachers and staff became interested and began networking among themselves to effectuate changes in the affective activities of their students. In subtle ways the social climate in some classrooms improved, suggesting that the individual sessions with children in the target group may have realized some results. A calmer, more cooperative atmosphere prevailed. Many parents indicated that they had reordered their priorities for their children. Most became interested in the information made available to them which opened channels of communication between them and the school which did not previously exist. Because all parties involved expressed a favorable response to the experience, there is every indication that continued application of the solution strategy will have lasting effects.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

THE WORK SETTING

The setting in which this practicum took place is a private school situated in a suburban community in the southeastern United States.

By area standards, the operation is a large one. It is licensed by the county child care agency for slightly more than 400 children. Indoor space totals 14,000 square feet. The licensing agency has jurisdiction over schools which serve children under five years of age. The school, however, also serves children above that age. The capacity formula used by this licensing agency allows for more children than can truthfully be accommodated without compromising quality. Ideally, the school in question would operate optimally with a capacity of about 275. The school administration is very cognizant of this discrepancy and abides by the smaller, ideal capacity figure. Presently, the school has an enrollment of 200 full-time equivalent students.

The physical layout includes twelve self-contained classroom areas, an infant center, an art room, a separate lunchroom, and an after-school recreation area. This configuration eliminates the need for more than one group of children to occupy any one area.

Such a situation, cuts down on noise and distraction. The building is modern, well-lit, and colorfully decorated. Each classroom depicts the character and teaching style of the instructor. Teachers are invited to personalize their classrooms within the framework of appropriate room design.

A large, spacious playground boasts a wooden play structure, a playhouse, and a canopied picnic table. Adjacent to that are two tennis courts, two racquetball courts, and a volleyball court bordered by a large, open field for sports. Additionally, there is a separate infant/toddler playground.

THE COMMUNITY

The school is located in an executive office park and is situated in direct proximity to other executive complexes. A sizeable percentage of students are enrolled whose parents work in the area, but do not live nearby. Conversely, there are several residential areas within one to three miles which serve as an additional market. The reputation and quality of the school draws an additional number of students from an even wider radius.

The school serves children of all ages. The infant center cares for children from six weeks old. A

transitional toddler group spans sixteen months through twenty four months. The nursery school groups children into two levels - those two by September 1 and those three by September 1. Entry into pre-kindergarten is restricted to those children who are four by September 1. The kindergarten deadline is extended to students who turn five by December 1 who demonstrate developmental maturity. Presently, the school provides primary grades through third.

A profile of the families served would span socio-economic class. Approximately 40% might fall into the upper-middle class, 50% are middle class, while 10% fall below middle class and are eligible for reduced rates. The school receives subsidies for these families either through Title XX (income eligible), the Jobs Program (Beta, Project Independence, WIN), or HRS (at-risk clients). To add further dimension to this profile, it is useful to look at family structure. The percentage of two-income families approximates 70%; 15% are married with just one income and the remaining 15% are single parents.

STAFF PROFILE

The staff consists of twenty six employees, twelve of whom are not only degreed but also experienced teachers. Six others are childcare assistants who are joined by five late afternoon employees who are either high school seniors or college students with an interest in pursuing careers in education. The remaining three staff members are the educational director, the administrator, and an administrative assistant.

All staff is required to complete inservice/continuing education courses. The specific requirements of the school exceed county guidelines on this issue. Staff meetings are held regularly and teachers are provided planning time. A plethora of resources is available to all staff. Current information is readily disseminated on an ongoing basis. An operations handbook exists to standardize both goals and policies. Staff and parents alike receive documentation from this source.

The school has been accredited by NAEYC - the National Association for the Education of the Young Child - and currently seeks further accreditation by the Association of Independent Schools, the Council of

Independent Schools and its kindergarten affiliate as well. The educational director aspires to be a viable force in the child care/early childhood education community. It is the administration's intent to provide a quality service to the community in all aspects pertinent to the young child. An active Parent Teacher Organization exists and an informal parent advisory board meets with administration frequently.

ROLE OF THE WRITER

The writer is a partner in the business and serves as educational director. This is a broad-based title which encompasses many duties. The writer generates school philosophy - an evolving process which incorporates the needs of the community with developmentally appropriate practices. Further, ongoing curriculum development is in the job description - including adoption of new core materials, acquisition of supplies, purchasing, and so forth. The writer administrates the educational staff. This involves teacher observations, staff meetings, conducting informal child study sessions, staff development, mentoring, and any other task that ensures that the staff is fulfilling its obligation to

the children enrolled in the school and carrying forth school goals and philosophy. Complementary to that role is the important job of interacting with parents. In some cases, it is necessary for the director to play an intermediary role between parents and teachers. At other times, parents merely require assurance of their effectiveness or they seek experienced, yet informal advice on various and sundry issues. In this age of fragmented families, the absence of extended families, and geographic transience, often the school is the only constant factor, not only for the students, but for their parents as well. A skilled school director must be sensitive to this issue.

In addition to dealing with staff and parents, in the capacity of principal, the writer adopts a hands-on approach to interacting with the children - the most important resource. First and foremost, is the writer's commitment to know every child by name. Hugs and stories are the mainstay, followed by large doses of praise for achievements of any kind. For some children, however, this is not enough. Rather than assuming the role of a disciplinarian who metes out punishments for infractions, the writer works with children who face difficult transitions into school or

within their school experience. Behavior modification programs are designed for children who demonstrate aggressive, negative, or withdrawn behaviors. In the role of principal, the writer attempts to keep open channels of communication with parents. A strong partnership between parents and school is an essential factor not only in behavior management, but also in the quest for learning.

CHAPTER II: STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

PROBLEM DESCRIPTION

A certain group of students in this school setting demonstrated a need for improvement in prosocial, interactional skills, "...the cooperating, sharing, supportive actions which children direct at one another" (Cline, 1979, p.3). Within this group, a disproportionate number of aggressive acts were being committed. The definition of aggression in this context was not merely confined to frequent incidences of unprovoked hostility and selfishness, but also to those inappropriate, sometimes verbal, often physical responses to even the most innocuous overtures of others.

Consequently, this group, in most instances, did not demonstrate age-appropriate social competence. Many of the children were unable to share. This refusal to share extended not only to their own possessions, but also to the toys and equipment available within the school and to sharing as the attention of other students and adults. Parallel to this, many of the children additionally were consistently unwilling to take turns with other children. They were rooted firmly in their demands

for instant gratification. This group of children usually had little regard either for personal property or that of others; they exhibited a pervasive "consumable" attitude towards all things encountered.

When observed during snack or lunch time, these children were among those who seemed to be in a hurry to eat their food and anxious to be excused from the table. Often, meals were left mostly uneaten. They rarely exercised good table manners such as properly using utensils, eating with their mouths closed, or wiping their hands and faces without constant reminders from the staff. The eating habits of this group were characterized by haste and impatience. These traits seemed to be interwoven throughout all aspects of their daily behavior.

On the average, these children did not demonstrate spontaneous prosocial acts. It was infrequent that such a child approached any other child in a mutually rewarding manner. Rather, interactions eventually become manipulative and one-sided. These children were generally not sensitive to the emotional needs of others nor were they empathetic of others. In fact, a high frequency of defensive behaviors was observed. Blame was swiftly levied against others and remorse was rare.

Although each of these indicators of low social competence was not present in each child, nor did all of them exhibit each to the same degree, nonetheless a profile was emerging.

The presence of such inappropriate social skills often fosters an inability for a child to funotion acceptably in group activities. In a school setting, as in society, success is measured by the degree to which a person handles himself in the company of others. This group characteristically had a shorter attention span than its counterparts of similar chronological age. Thus, midway through a lesson or other structured group activity, these children had begun to lose interest and to create distractions and disturbances. More often than not, such a child was unwilling to join the group at all. The shortness of attention span, the high desire for instant gratification, together with a high level of non-compliance, created a situation in which these children were failing to developmentally acquire good listening skills. Whereas, at the same time, their classmates were learning to listen and to problem solve - skills which are indisputably critical.

To be categorized within this group of students whose behaviors were being analyzed, it was evident that a

child would have a high incidence of the above-mentioned characteristics. If such were the case, not only would the teacher have observed this, but most likely it would have come to the attention of other staff and administration also. More than likely, too, parent conferences with the teacher and administration would have been held. From these parent meetings, another characteristic common to the children emerged. In one way or another, parents of this type of child appeared to demonstrate an inability to deal with their offspring. This inability manifested itself in a variety of ways. Often parents offered the school staff little support. Some felt that school behaviors were school problems. Others were simply unwilling to deal with the problem and to openly admit their inability to effect a change in their child's behavior. Interestingly, hardly any refused to admit that their children were as difficult to manage at home as they were at school. More often than not, these parents had little or no participation in their child's school experience. Usually, it was an issue of avoidance. For others, time constraints made an all too easy excuse. They would rush through the driveway for a.m. drop off and then wait impatiently at the p.m. pickup area. Unlike public school where parents often do not approach the school

grounds, these parents had the opportunity to be at the school twice each day. Still other parents refused to give up their time. They had set other priorities for themselves.

Another group of parents equally unable to deal effectively with their children did make efforts to work with their children; yet they practiced a sort of band-aid surgery. They meted out punishment when necessary or offered rewards for singular good deeds rather than providing a solid framework for ongoing, good behavior. Most notably, perseverance and long-term consistency were lacking. Children are keenly perceptive of such parental shortcomings.

Aggressive and competitive personality characteristics are sometimes demonstrated by certain parents. Often actions, gestures, thought processes, and personality traits which are admirable or, at least, acceptable in adults can be regarded as precocious and even unacceptable in children. Yet, some parents consciously or unconsciously make an effort to create adult-like conversations and relationships with their children . Similarly, there are children who grow up with prolonged exposure to experiences that underscore competition, self-indulgence, and aggression. Using discretion and social pleasantries to exact a desired

outcome is far too complex a strategy for young minds. They only see parents getting what they want and doing what they please - the nuances go unrecognized. Unknowingly, therefore, parents with little knowledge of effective parenting and appropriate practices can very possibly send the wrong messages to their children.

Another situation exists when parents expose their children to background anger. In some cases, there is anger evident within the family unit or extensions thereof. Occasionally, neighborhood situations create background anger. More pervasive , however, is the anger proliferated by violent TV shows, video presentations, and movies.

In the school setting in question, it had been observed that teachers did not always structure group activities in a way that fostered spontaneous prosocial responses. Classroom clarification of acceptable standards of sportsmanship and manners were often overlooked. Children who did not meet these standards were not sufficiently remediated as they would have been if they had not met academic standards. Preconceived notions tended to lead staff away from the right track. Many teachers

unnecessarily created competitive situations within their classrooms.

Children who tend to act aggressively are prone to generate feelings of frustration when faced with competition. This frustration begets further aggression. By this time, the teacher has manufactured a vicious cycle. Again, consistency in expectations is of paramount importance. Of equal importance is a little forethought in the planning of small group activities to eliminate incidents of anger and aggression before they happen. By not preparing for the worst case scenarios of these children, teachers can often exascerbate the ongoing problem.

The problem described most certainly affected the children in question. They were continually in a struggle with themselves, their peers, teachers and parents alike. Yet, perhaps, the other children in the school setting were the most affected. Their social and learning environments were often interrupted. A friendly, outgoing child eager to play with his classmates easily learns that the child who is not as well-tempered can upset the balance in the classroom or the playground. This sends a variety of messages to this child. It teaches him that each of us has a different personality make up - a healthy

lesson to learn. However, it also teaches him negative lessons about group dynamics. In some cases, school and play experiences which are meant to be happy ones, become unpleasant memories for the child who witnesses the outbursts of an aggressive child. When a child frequently demonstrates inappropriate, aggressive social responses in a group situation, it exposes all the other children to background anger which , in turn, may well affect their responses. Also, it is evident that parents and teachers are affected by this problem. Some question their parenting and teaching skills and, as can be expected, they look for the opportunity to place the onus of responsibility elsewhere. For parents and teachers alike, the presence of such a child can be a trying, stressful experience. Continued attempts to either circumvent or eliminate opportunities for aggressive responses eventually become burdensome or they fail causing adults to feel powerless and inadequate.

There are many reasons why the problem had not been solved. Suffice it to say that the time constraints and priorities of both parents and teachers prohibited truly open channels of communication between the two. Yet, it was important that there be a common philosophy between the home and the school with

reference to educational success, moral development, and behavior management so that a level of consistency could be maintained. Up to this time, no bona fide effort had been made to strive for this goal. Parents and teachers had not formally worked together to set their priorities, to clarify their values, and to manage their time for the common purpose of fostering prosocial behavior in these children. Behavior charts and other systems of reward and/or punishment were not effective because teachers and parents had not espoused a more holistic approach to the problem.

Briefly stated, some of children in the school setting regularly demonstrated a lack of age-appropriate prosocial skills, while at the same time, they exhibited inappropriate, aggressive behaviors. With regard to this same group of children, parents and teachers appeared either had difficulty dealing with or may actually have contributed to these inappropriate behaviors.

PROBLEM DOCUMENTATION

As in any school situation, certain children stood out as aggressive by nature not only to their teachers, but to students and other observers as well. In order to more formally identify the children whose

aggressive behaviors were most disturbing to the learning environment within the school from the teachers' points-of-view, a two-fold questionnaire was presented to all classroom teachers (see Appendix A). Each teacher completed a profile on each child in the class which contained ten prosocial attributes. The teacher was required to respond whether the child exhibited these attributes always, usually, frequently, sometimes, or never. The second part of the questionnaire surveyed the teacher's assessment of the degree to which the parent(s) participated in the child's school experience. When these profiles were completed, each teacher was given an additional survey (see Appendix B). This survey asked them to identify five children who were not in their class who, in their opinion, displayed inappropriate aggressive behaviors.

These two surveys indicated that the children who showed the least display of prosocial attributes from their own teacher's perspective often showed up on the lists of other teachers. From this, it was concluded that the inappropriate behaviors perceived by the classroom teachers were not isolated incidences, but rather emerging profiles. Usually, too, the parent factor segment of the survey indicated less than total

school involvement on the part of the parents of such children.

In order to assess this from an administrative point of view, another survey was used to observe any lack of social competence. Adapted from a study by Hendricks in 1972 (Kobak, 1981), every child in each class was observed for six second intervals (see Appendix C). The observer started at the top of the class list and went through it forty times rating each child in one of three categories each time he was observed. The child was either rated as socially inactive - playing or sitting alone; socially active - talking, sharing, playing with others; or aggressive - shouting, demanding, or harmful to others. This format allowed short episodes of anti-social expressions to either go unrecorded or recorded just one time. An average was created for each child with regard to each category. The percentage results in the aggressive category were ranked school-wide in descending order by student (see Appendix D). As could be expected, many of the same names were appearing near the top of this list.

A values clarification survey (created by Marilyn Segal of Nova University) was conducted with the parents of ten children who were categorized as

aggressive by the above rules-of-thumb, the parents of the ten children whose percentage of aggressive interactions on the survey adapted from Hendricks were the lowest by school-wide ranking, and all of the classroom teachers (see Appendix E & F). This survey measured parents' and teachers' priorities for their children and summarized them into six areas: process goals, cooperation, obedience, success, competition, and ethical values. The responses were coded to give a value in each of the six areas to assess the priority given to each of these concepts (see Appendix F). The responses from parents whose children tended to exhibit aggressive behaviors differed from those whose children had age-appropriate prosocial behaviors. The average scores in the areas of competition, success, and obedience were higher for the first group and the remaining three categories revealed lower averages. Further, the average scores for th second group more closely ressembled the staff averages than the first group (see table 1). This suggests that the children who were acting in an aggressive fashion may, in effect, have been receiving contradicting signals between the home and the school.

Evidence that this problem existed was gathered from the classroom teachers, other teachers,

administration, and parents. By identifying these children from at least four perspectives, one could be reasonably certain that the inappropriate behaviors, and therefore the problems, did exist. The information gathering instruments used also cast light on some of the causes of the problem.

CAUSATIVE ANALYSIS

It is certainly not sufficient to say that this pervasive problem is caused by a changing society in which the nuclear family has undergone immeasurable stresses and strains which threaten its very fibre. Nevertheless, it is the quintessential starting point for a detailed analysis of the causes of the problem at hand.

Child-rearing practices have undergone radical changes in the last generation. The influences of the sixties, characterized by the challenge of establishment and authority, followed by the self-interest of the seventies and eighties have affected group dynamics in general and family dynamics in particular. The communal feelings of the sixties may have given rise to the questioning of authority in a radical fashion, yet people cared about each other and were sensitive to the needs of others. The

succeeding decades brought to bear a sense of selfishness wherein personal gratification superceded all other aspects of social morality. The "me decade" - the seventies, was followed by a materialistic "disposable decade" - the eighties. Therefore, a new definition of "family" is emerging. As adults seek to adapt to everchanging life styles, it is difficult for them to convey secure, confident values to their children. People of all ages are affected by influences which did not exist for previous generations.

Parents today feel pressure from their peers to raise accomplished children (Elder, 1989). A competitive life-style ensues. Rather than providing their children with the unencumbered childhoods of the baby boomers, this generation is raising type A tots - kids who are fast-paced, competitive, and aggressive. (Elder). They are deprived of the pure learning that is derived from play. This generation of parents has not only set higher standards for its children, but also it is experiencing anxiety concerning the art of parenting. A factor, in part, is the lack of extended families. Parents have no parenting models available to them to assuage their fears of ineptitude. So, overtaxed, frustrated children left in the wake of our

changing society are much more frequently demonstrating overall some unusually aggressive behaviors.

Parenting is not a thoughtless task. Those who give it no thought usually do their children more harm than good. Perhaps, in their busy lives, parents have allowed their children to lose sight of the golden rule. Many parents have not examined their values or their priorities as they relate to parenting. In society, there is no doubt that success, competition, and conformity (obedience) are essential values for upward mobility. Yet these same values can easily spell doom for a young child. It is necessary for parents to understand that a productive citizen can only espouse those success-oriented values after having internalized a moral code with which to temper them. Our society has become fast-paced. In order to achieve career goals people must invest a lot of time in their work. On the other hand, due to economic conditions, many people not on the corporate ladder find themselves obligated to put in lots of hours at work simply to meet their obligations. Parents who spend the best part of their day in this type of stressful environment are likely sapped of strength and enthusiasm at just the hour that they are reunited

with their families. Rather than dinner time and evening time being set aside for quality interactions, often that time of day becomes the "bewitching hour" when all parties involved are tired and cranky. The stress of the workday/ workweek takes its toll by diminishing a parent's nurturing capacity.

Some parents have little or no knowledge of effective parenting techniques. They are unaware of developmentally appropriate practices and are ignorant of the characteristics of the developmental stages children pass through. As such, they are unable to formulate proper expectations for their children. Without these, the parent can unknowingly frustrate the child or become frustrated themselves thereby modeling, or otherwise reinforcing, inappropriate behaviors that can thwart social development.

Social learning theorists underscore the intensity of learning that is derived from modeling the behavior of significant others. Children's social learning is, therefore, a function of the role models in their lives. These models can be adults or children - real or fictitious. Children who show a lack of social competence may never have had social skills demonstrated - or modeled - to them. More likely, however, these children are modeling behaviors that

are not prosocial. They may be witness to background anger in the home or neighborhood which reinforces inappropriate behaviors.

A great many parents exercise very little censorship upon their children's television and movie viewing or upon the length of time spent in these activities. The proliferation of violence in the media is a force with which to be reckoned. It is quite conceivable that a child whose behavior is difficult to manage will not be limited in television or video viewing because it gives the parents a respite from dealing with the child's behaviors. Excessive exposure to media with anti-social themes has its effects on behavior.

Unfortunately, too often, children who establish a pattern of behaviors have difficulty breaking out of the mold that has been cast for them. Aggressive children are reacted to negatively by adults and peers which only serves to create a self-fulfilling prophecy. The negative attention reinforces the aggressive behaviors.

Another way the problem regenerates itself is that in a school situation, it becomes all too easy to pacify an aggressive child, to give in to his demands merely

to calm a potentially disruptive situation. Since other children's learning and enjoyment are being jeopardized, a quick negotiation is often deemed more beneficial than facing the problem head on. Needless to say, parents resort to this as well. It is certainly easier to negotiate - and, in a sense, give in - either at home, or especially in public surroundings.

Not enough is done in the school situation to work on teaching and increasing social skills of these children. Although feelings are shared daily in circle time activities, manners are stressed, and classroom rules are discussed within the course of the school day, this takes place on a large group instructional basis. Readiness/academic skills are introduced and taught to small groups whose ability levels are similar. Yet, social skills are not presented in the same fashion. It is evident that some children have a slower rate of development in terms of social competence; yet, they are not receiving needs-based instruction on an on-going basis. No preventative measures are in effect. Furthermore, it appears that the staff is more concerned with effectuating a change in the students behaviorally by soliciting parental support and by

creating elaborate reward systems than giving consideration to restructuring the environment to eliminate frustration and competition and, hence, the need for aggressive responses.

Altogether too many parents have little or no involvement with the school. The ensuing result is that the children perceive no integration of school and home: no common link exists for them. Without this link, a common reaction on the part of a child is that one has no bearing on the other and school is accorded little significance. The child who believes that his parent has no regard for the school considers the school a stopping off point while mom and/or dad is at work and of no consequence. With this attitud , the child will more than likely take on other inappropriate behaviors as well. On the other hand, with proper communication and support between the school and the family, children place a higher value on their presence in school and a higher regard for themselves and the people therein.

RELATIONSHIP OF THE PROBLEM TO THE LITERATURE

Dealing with aggression as it relates to young children is often perplexing to adults. On one hand

it is a natural emotion that is inherent to the social development process (Gray, 1981). It is "..the common response when one's physical or psychological space is threatened" (Gray, p.2). Yet, on the other hand, the rights of other children in a group setting must be respected when the aggressive responses of one hurt the others (Feeney, 1988).

It is necessary to briefly state that there are certainly biological factors in the existence of aggressive behaviors in young children. Every organism has its individual set of chemical responses to both internal and external stimuli which creates a perceptual framework that is entirely different from any other organism. Hence, no two people have the same reactions. Rather, these different reactions form a continuum from acceptable to inappropriate. Not only do people have anatomical individuality, but further, multiple influences from within the organism and from the environment create many different pathways for social development (Skolnick, 1986). Aggressive behavior is influenced by society, family, as well as individual endowment according to Gray (1981).

The experiences which a child encounters mold his social development. Commissions or omissions on the

part of parents, in particular, are the major contributors to the social being that emerges. "The family is the primary and most fundamental influence in the preschooler's development" (Grotberg, 1977, p.10).

Social learning theorists place much emphasis on the intensity of behavior that is learned by modeling. Field and Vega-Lahr (1986) suggest that aggressive children may very well be modeling Type A behaviors of their parents - specifically aggression and competitiveness. Cummings (1987) supposed that children modeled inappropriate behaviors that were exhibited in their environment. Examples of this would be anger between parents, neighborhood hostility, violence in the media, and even displays of aggression in school settings. His findings supported the assumption that exposure to background anger increased the likelihood that children would perform aggressive acts. The effects of television viewing on children has been an issue of debate for many years. By Cummings' theory, violent television shows would be construed as background anger which children might model. Stein (1973) reports in her findings that boys showed a decline in prosocial behavior after watching aggressive films. The boys who watched

prosocial programming had low aggression scores. Stein's findings for the female population of the study were not significant.

Erikson defines social development "...as the process of social interaction between the child and his parents..." (Skolnick, 1986, p. 92). Without positive parental direction, the child is unable to successfully maneuver through these stages and develops inappropriate social skills. The child may perceive the world as hostile or rejecting and remain in a constant state of anxiety thereby exhibiting aggressive, impulsive activity. (Gray) The influences of the family upon socialization is not a new concept. In Contrat Social, Jean Jacques Rousseau postulates that the natural society is, in fact, the family (Koback, 1981).

Socially acceptable behavior is likely to be demonstrated when a child is happy and comfortable. Children who display generally negative emotions will most likely not act in a prosocial manner. Denham (1986) states that moods and general temperament are important indicators of social competence. Further, preschoolers are self-centered and not ready to incorporate social rules. At this point in development, perspective taking is not present (Cline,

1979). Neither is the consideration of intention. The young child can not take into consideration that something happened unintentionally, by accident. According to Kohlberg (stated in Skolnick, 1986), the young child has a concrete concept of moral reasoning and demands "an eye for an eye" regardless.

Elardo (1980) suggests that many adults find themselves parents, yet they have not clarified their own social values. These conflicts become increasingly more apparent as they try to make sound childrearing judgments. These children will have a difficult time achieving social competence if their parents social values have yet to emerge. Overly permissive parents and those who are especially restrictive teach their children to rely on the use of power - aggression - to reach their goals (Kim and Stevens, 1987). It is important that parents be congruent in their childrearing attitudes lest the children's social development be affected by this lack of agreement. Sparks (1984) studied thirty preschoolers and found that those with the lowest prosocial behaviors had mothers who had a high need to control and fathers who were less involved in childrearing. The results of another study make a statement on the role of the father in childrearing.

Roke (1980) studied parents affection and discipline techniques as it related to cooperativeness in their children. The findings showed that there was no significance based on the mothers' techniques; but, that father's discipline related positively to their daughters' cooperation but negatively to their sons'. Interestingly, the sons' cooperation was positively related to affection on the part of the father. Parental values often foster aggressive tendencies when children are admonished for not fighting back or demanding one's rightful share. Parents who view the world as a hostile place consider these attributes necessary for their own and their children's survival (Cline, 1979).

Eisenberg and Lennon (1987) suggest that prosocial behavior begets prosocial behavior and the converse as well. They found that children are less apt to react prosocially to another child who expresses need, if the need is anger. Happy children elicit happy responses from their peers.

Teachers very often negatively reinforce aggressive behavior by calling attention to it. Slaby and Crowley (1977) hypothesized that cooperation and aggression were mutually exclusive terms and therefore were incompatible. By ignoring aggressive behaviors

and attending to cooperative behaviors they found that cooperative behaviors could increase. They go on to say that it is more difficult to identify cooperative behavior because it so often goes unnoticed while aggressive behaviors are louder and more recognizable. Also, in naturalistic settings, aggression does not receive as much attention. It is further noted in the literature that young children who do not attend a group care setting are more likely to demonstrate cooperation and concern for others - prosocial skills. An important finding by Schenk and Grusak (1987) was that children with day care experience showed less concern for the needs of others, especially adults - which was tested in the study. The reason suggested was that busy teachers and equally busy working parents do little to encourage the children to respond prosocially to others.

CHAPTER III: ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

STATEMENT OF GOALS

It was hoped that through implementation of this practicum incidences of aggressive behavior in the school setting could be reduced. The writer anticipated that the students in question would display prosocial behaviors more often, their parents would evaluate and clarify their values as they relate to childrearing, and the parents would also demonstrate an interest in their child's school experience.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

At the end of the twelve week period, the students in the target group were observed again under the same conditions (see Appendix C). The following goals were projected for the practicum. The percentage of aggressive responses would decrease by ten points. Additionally, the percentage of prosocial responses would correspondingly increase by ten points.

Classroom teachers completed a second student evaluation questionnaire for these children (see Appendix A). Teachers were instructed to make their

responses based on the twelve week period only. It was projected that the prosocial score of each child would increase by at least .5 over the previous score.

It was further anticipated that parents of these children would visit the school either to talk to the teacher or to spend time with their child in the parent-child resource room at least twelve times during implementation. Parents completed the values q-sort again at the end of the twelve week period (see Appendix E). It was projected that scores in the areas of competition, obedience, and success would each decrease by at least three points (see Appendix F).

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Teacher responses to each item on the prosocial student questionnaire (see Appendix A) were assigned a numeric value based on the degree to which the child exhibited that particular attribute. When each questionnaire was completed, the individual attribute values were calculated to arrive at an average prosocial score for each child. A frequency chart was made to tabulate teacher responses to the additional survey (see Appendix B). The numeric value assigned to each child from this frequency chart was then

subtracted from the average prosocial score. The resulting scores were ranked from lowest to highest (see Appendix G). The students with the ten lowest scores became part of the target group.

Scores on the administrator's survey (see Appendix D) for each student yielded a percentage of prosocial responses, a percentage of inactive responses, and a percentage of aggressive responses which together equaled 100%. Scores in the aggressive response category only were ranked from highest percentage to lowest (see Appendix D). The students with the ten highest aggressive scores were compared with those with the ten lowest prosocial scores on the teacher's prosocial questionnaire. Students whose names appeared on either or both of these lists became part of the target group.

The teacher's prosocial questionnaire and the administrator's observation were administered at the end of the twelve week implementation period to evaluate the solution strategy. At that time, scores were compiled in much the same way, but the purpose was to compare scores of individual students with their c prior scores.

The values clarification survey was initially given to all teachers and to the parents of the students in the target group, as described above, and the parents of the ten students who had the lowest aggressive scores on the administrator's observation. For each group a mean score was calculated in each of the six areas 1) competition, 2) obedience, 3) success, 4) processing, 5) cooperation, 6) ethical values and the categories were ranked to show a values profile for each of the three groups. At the end of implementation, the parents of the children in the target group were asked to complete this survey again and an adjusted profile was created for that group. Individual as well as group profiles were analyzed for the direction and degree of change over the implementation period.

CHAPTER IV: SOLUTION STRATEGY

SOLUTIONS IN THE LITERATURE

Both adult-child and child-child dynamics have an impact on prosocial development. In naturalistic settings, it is difficult to anticipate how other children are going to react or respond to any child. Certainly, though, it should be possible to positively configure the adult-child factor. Kim and Stevens (1987) implore teachers and parents to become social planners, to arrange the environment for prosocial development, to emphasize collaboration instead of competition, to introduce strategies to solve conflicts, especially to model kindness and altruism, and to reinforce positive social skills. They go on to state that parents must demand mature, considerate, and helpful behaviors and provide opportunities for their children to use them. Children are more apt to be socially responsible if their parents require it and show outrage at acts of aggression, inductively reasoning what the best course of action should have been. Children whose emotional needs are met in a nurturing, stable environment are more likely to exhibit prosocial behavior (Hoffman, Strayer, cited in Denham, 1987).

Brown and Elliott (cited in Slaby and Crowley, 1977) were able to reduce some acts of aggression by rewarding all positive attempts at cooperation and ignoring the negative. In their own study, Slaby and Crowley found that merely a statement acknowledging that a child used cooperative rather than aggressive speech was enough reinforcement to increase the occurences of cooperative speech, rewards or praise were not necessary. Unfortunately they found that teachers found it easier to attend to verbally aggressive speech than cooperative speech. Habits die hard. Prosocial interactions can also be initiated by encouraging children to help others (Eisenberg, Pasternack, Cameron, Tryon, 1984). Sharing involves the loss of an object, whereas helping does not. So, children who won't act prosocially and share may very well help when asked - another prosocial skill. An increase in prosocial behaviors in heretofore unsociable children was effectuated after pairing social children with their antisocial counterparts for thirty minutes a day for twenty days (Koch, cited in Ropnarine and Honig, 1985). Furman, Rahe, and Hartup (1979) paired children with younger children, those of the same age, and used a control group without pairing. Their findings were that aggressive children more often dis' layed socially acceptable behaviors

when paired with younger children. Eisenberg-Berg and Neal (1979) tried to stimulate moral reasoning by asking children to explain their prosocial behaviors.

It is important that parents of young children be cognizant of the growth and development characteristics at each age (Feeney, 1988). This will lessen the chance that expectations might be unrealistic, which can affect the social development of the child. Elardo (1980) strongly commends that parents and child care staff build a united approach to childrearing so as to eliminate conflicts that might arise from differing values. He also strongly urges parents to clarify their own values.

In the classroom it is essential to make prosocial development part of the curriculum (Roopnarine and Honig, 1985). Teachers should become sensitive to group dynamics and peer group acceptance. Children who are rejected by the group "engage in more verbal and physical aggression" (Roopnarine and Honig, p. 61). It is a teacher's responsibility to redirect the dynamics that create this rejection. Teachers should work with families to encourage cooperation and social skills in their children. Teachers and parents alike need reminders to model warmth, concern, and cooperation. Unpopular children or those who are less

socially competent can benefit from puppetry, role playing, and books in small group situation. Hendrick (1972) recommends that teachers spend some time at the beginning of each day in a one-on-one situation with the aggressive child to circumvent inappropriate behaviors. A well-planned physical layout in the classroom can also enhance prosocial behaviors as can properly planned daily activities (Gray).

Zahavi and Asher (1975) present a solution that was most adaptable to this practicum. Their findings that aggressive children benefit from individual instruction with regard to socialization concur with that of Hendrick. Zahavi and Asher sought to examine the effect of verbal instruction on aggressive behavior. They postulated that since research indicates that the parents of prosocial children are most likely more verbal in that they rationalize and discuss sociability with their children, it is possible that this verbalization increases the resistance on the part of the child to commit aggressive acts. By observing all the children in a preschool, they identified eight children to be aggressive. These children were individually taught that aggression hurts others and doesn't solve problems. They were given positive ways to deal with

situations. This transpired in one ten minute session with the classroom teacher. A follow-up observation at a later date provided evidence that the instructional period had a lasting effect.

SOLUTION SELECTED

Having already adapted Zahavi and Asher's observation method as a means of identifying aggressive children in the school setting in the problem documentation section of this practicum, the writer adapted their individual instruction concept in the solution phase. Being familiar with the target group children, the writer reasonably doubted that just one session of prosocial instruction would have lasting effects. Therefore, each child received instruction three times during the implementation period. The instruction involved showing each child photopictures of children who were either behaving prosocially or aggressively. The instructor attempted to elicit responses from the child that would indicate that the aggressive children in the pictures are unhappy and others do not like their behavior while the prosocial children are happy, their teachers and parents are proud of them, and the other children like them. The children were asked which pictures they preferred and to state how each picture made them feel. To conclude, the instructor

explained to each child that inappropriate behaviors hurt others and do not solve problems.

At the outset of implementation, parents and teachers of the children in the target group received information that relates to fostering prosocial behaviors in children. For both groups, the emphasis was on modeling altruistic behavior and reacting positively to prosocial acts. Teachers received information culled from the writer's research on classroom management and intervention of aggressive behaviors. Emphasis was on minimizing competitive and frustrating activities. Parents of children in the target group received information on age-appropriate practices and childrearing techniques.

Parents of children in the target group were invited to make weekly visits to the school to speak with the teacher and to spend time in the parent-child resource room which was created with this purpose in mind. This room is equipped with housekeeping toys in one corner, an area for puzzles, a music corner, and a library area. Here parents could spend time with their children in the school setting. Parents were encouraged to play with their child in any of the center areas. No more than three parent-child groups could use the room at any one time. Use of the room

was not limited to parents whose children were in the target group. No observations or evaluations were made except that parents were asked to keep record of their attendances.

By providing children, parents, and teachers with strategies to minimize aggressive acts and to consciously foster social competence, it was expected that the stated objectives would be met during the implementation period.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Teachers in the work setting often lamented the presence of aggressive children in their classrooms. These children were not only identified by their classroom teachers, but the administration and other staff members as well.

Both parental and school factors contributed to this problem. Some parents had not formulated or clarified their values as they related to childrearing, thereby sending inappropriate messages to their children. As a result, in some situations, aggressive, competitive, and otherwise inappropriate behaviors were being modeled to these children. Frequently, parents showed little interest in their child's school experience. Further, it had been observed that all too often, teachers did not structure group activities in a way that fostered spontaneous pro-social responses. Classroom clarification of rules and manners were often overlooked. More importantly children who did not meet acceptable social standards were not sufficiently remediated as they would have been if they did not meet readiness or academic standards.

In an attempt to remedy this situation, a three-fold strategy was employed. The aim of the solution strategy was to actively involve the parents and the teachers as well as the children in a process of change. Ten children in the school who were identified as particularly aggressive and who did not demonstrate age-appropriate social skills were the target group.

At the conclusion of the implementation period, the children in the target group were observed by the administrator under the same conditions as they were observed prior to the outset of the solution strategy, using the Zahavi and Asher (1975) method described in the problem documentation section in Chapter II of this paper. It was anticipated that each child's percentage of observed aggressive responses would decrease by ten percent and that the number of social responses observed would increase by ten percent. Although results did not overwhelmingly validate this objective, there was evidence of some positive change (see Table 1). Only three out of ten children in the target group were observed to have both decreased the incidence of aggressive activity and increased the frequency of social activity in the school setting as stated in the objectives of the solution strategy.

The stated objectives were partially met in two other cases wherein a decrease in aggressive behavior was shown; yet, there was no significant change in the frequency of social acts committed. In a further demonstration of partially met objectives, three children demonstrated an increase in social activity with either no change or an increase in the amount of aggressive activity. Two children, however, realized no observable improvement over the initial observation, but rather demonstrated even more aggressive acts and less socially acceptable ones than before.

COMPARISON OF ADMINISTRATOR'S OBSERVATION RESULTS BETWEEN PRE- AND POST-IMPLEMENTATION APPLICATIONS

S	Decrease aggression (10% or more)	Increase aggression	No change	Increase social (10% or more)	Decrease social	No Change
1.	x	-	-	-	-	x
2.	x	-	-	-	-	x
3.	-	x	-	x	-	-
4.	x	-	-	x	-	-
5.	-	-	x	x	-	-
6.	-	x	-	-	x	-
7.	-	x	-	-	x	-
8.	x	-	-	x	-	-
9.	x	-	-	x	-	-
10.	-	-	x	x	-	-

(Table 1)

Secondly, classroom teachers reevaluated the social behavior of the children in the target group by completing the student evaluation questionnaire (see Appendix A) based solely upon each child's behavior during the twelve week implementation period. The objective was that the prosocial score that this questionnaire yielded would increase at least .5 over the original score based on observations of the children's behaviors prior to the implementation period. Table 2 reveals significant increases in the prosocial scores of seven out of the ten children, with six meeting the specific criterion of improvement.

COMPARISON OF RESULTS OF PROSOCIAL PROFILE
BETWEEN PRE- AND POST-IMPLEMENTATION APPLICATIONS

Subject	Pre-test	Post-test	Change	Objective met
1.	2.9	3.5	.6	x
2.	1.6	2.0	.4	-
3.	1.85	2.5	.85	x
4.	1.7	1.3	-.4	-
5.	1.7	2.8	1.1	x
6.	1.85	1.5	-.35	-
7.	1.85	1.4	-.45	-
8.	1.85	3.1	1.25	x
9.	1.95	3.0	1.05	x
10.	2.3	3.3	1.0	x

(Table 2)

After the last of the twelve weekly visits the parents in the target group made to the school, they were asked to complete the Values Clarification Q-sort (see

Appendix E) once again. It was suggested that their responses might differ from the ones they made twelve weeks before. The scores of the ten respondents in each of the six values area were averaged. It was these averages from the pre-test and the post-test that were compared (see Table 3). The objective was that there would be a decrease of at least three points in the areas of competition, obedience, and success.

COMPARISON OF THE AVERAGE RESULTS OF THE VALUES CLARIFICATION Q-SORT: PRE- AND POST- IMPLEMENTATION APPLICATIONS

N=10

Values area	Pre-test	Post-test	Amount of change	Objective met
*Competition	12.10	10.80	-1.30	no
Processing	12.50	13.60	+1.10	n/a
*Obedience	17.80	14.30	-3.50	yes
*Success	17.50	15.10	-2.40	no
Cooperation	13.10	15.40	+2.30	n/a
Ethical Values	18.10	19.70	+1.60	n/a

(Table 3)

These results profiled the responses of the parents of the target group children both prior to and immediately after implementation of the solution strategy. The objectives therein were only partially met in that there was an overall decrease in the value placed on obedience without corresponding decreases in competition and success in school as had been

supposed. It should be noted that of the ten participants in the target group, individually, four actually did show decreases that exceeded three points in each of the three values area.

CONCLUSIONS

Although short of fully meeting its objectives, this practicum had many positive outcomes. The dissemination of information to teachers and to parents alone had beneficial effects. Staff members began networking among themselves in regard to the importance of including formal units on social development in their long-range planning as well as remediation for children whose skills are not appropriate. Many suggestions presented by the writer as well as some from staff members were immediately put into effect. Overt attempts to change their focus from the disruptive child to the prosocial child were sustained over the entire implementation period and thereafter. A substantive outgrowth of this networking was the formation of a committee at the suggestion of the staff itself to create a school-wide policy which spells out minimum standards of acceptable behavior. This statement will include reference to age-appropriate social development. It was conceived as a tool which parents and staff can

use to maintain a sense of consistency between the home and school environment. It should also be noted that the staff was quite emphatic that this statement will also contain age-appropriate consequences for unacceptable behaviors.

Parents of children in the target group were not given any indication that their invitation to spend time in school with their child was extended because their children behaved aggressively. They were, however, cordially and personally invited to be among the first to make use of the school's newly created Parent/Child Resource Room. Most were quite flattered by the invitation. All of the parents in the group found the first presentation of the Q-sort quite interesting. Many indicated by informal comments that their values were, in fact, in a state of flux. In addition to the time spent with their children in the school, all were quite diligent in picking up the handouts that were periodically made available to them. The writer tried to make herself available and it was not uncommon for these parents to make reference to the reading material or to report on their activities in the Resource Room. Several impromptu parenting discussions took place. When the Q-sort was readministered, the parents generally welcomed it. They were anxious to

see their results to compare themselves to the average parent and the average teacher scores. Many prided themselves on a better understanding of the task the second time. Yet, perhaps it can be concluded that they actually had a better understanding of their own values at that time.

The first two objectives in this study projected that each child or parent in the target group would demonstrate a stated level of change from the pre-test evaluations. In neither case did every child or parent realize the projected goals. However, seven out of ten children demonstrated the desired gain in social competence in at least one of the two objectives (see table 4). Two of those children met both objectives.

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS OF OBJECTIVES 1 AND 2 COMBINED

SUBJECT	OBJECTIVE ONE MET	OBJECTIVE TWO MET
1	NO	YES
2	NO	NO
3	NO	YES
4	YES	NO
5	NO	YES
6	NO	NO
7	NO	NO
8	YES	YES
9	YES	YES
10	NO	YES

(TABLE 4)

The purpose for using two different instruments to determine the target group was valid. Input from both

teachers and the administrator helped maintain a degree of objectivity. However, it might have been sufficient to include just one of these evaluations in the statement of objectives.

There is considerable evidence that the individual sessions aimed at remediating social skills together with the opportunities for parent-child interactions within the school had an effect on the children in the target group. The children had the occasion to positively relate to the administrator, whereas their previous encounters with her might have been in disciplinary situations. As a result of the implementation period, many of the children demonstrated by word and deed a special attachment to her. The children also enjoyed their parents' visits to the school. Many spoke positively about these visits to their peers as well as their teachers. It is not quite as easy to find clues to support the notion that either the efforts of the administrator to educate the staff in prosocial techniques or the efforts of the teachers themselves in that direction had, in fact, any impact on the children. Such results can only be implied.

The three children who showed no measurable change are considered the most difficult behavior problems in the

school. From the perspective of the administration and the teaching staff, there is little in the way of consistently effective parenting being exercised. The school receives no bona fide support in its efforts from these three sets of parents. There is no hostility, but rather, a regular lack of meaningful discipline, decisiveness, and consistency. Although these parents did participate in the program, their needs were much greater than the scope of this particular solution strategy.

The solution implemented herein was patterned after a study by Zahavi and Asher in which they found that aggressive children do benefit from instructions in socialization. The findings in the present study indicate that such instruction does have a lasting effect. A previous study by Hendrick demonstrated similar results. Zahavi and Asher also suggest that it is the verbalization during these instruction periods that increases the likelihood that the child will resist future aggressive acts. They support this notion with research that indicates that prosocial children have parents who are verbal and hence discuss sociability with their children. This writer has drawn somewhat different conclusions. Firstly, rather than attributing the success of the remediation on the

actual content - that which was discussed, perhaps the success lies in the positive, individual attention the child received. Secondly, the contention that parents who are very verbal with their children are apt to have prosocial children might have validity. Yet, with regard to the present target group, the converse to that theory can be refuted. The converse would suppose that the socially aggressive children whose parents are verbal with them will be more apt to improve their social skills given the opportunity. Nevertheless, the children who showed the least improvement during the implementation of the solution are those whose parents are considerably more verbal with them as compared to the remaining members of the target group.

Positive results and significant feelings of goodwill among the children, the teachers, and the parents were generated by this project. Subtle differences have been observed in the social climate in some of the classrooms in the school. They have taken on a calmer demeanor. Outbursts that have heretofore been frequent have been reduced. Some of the children in the target group have already had additional individual sessions either with the administrator or their own teachers. A few of the teachers have used the technique with

other children whom they consider to be socially needy, as well. The administrator has begun to conduct the individual sessions in lieu of other positive discipline techniques. Also, information that had been provided to the parents of the children in the target group is now being made available to other parents on an as-needed basis.

RECOMMENDATIONS

An area for further study would be to create specific affective objectives which would bring about prosocial behaviors in a developmental sequence. Parallel to that would be a different list of affective objectives which would eliminate aggressive behaviors. Once these objectives have been formulated, it would then be necessary to suggest a variety of activities through which these objectives could be met.

The writer believes that the remediation strategies such as those used with the undersocialized children in this practicum could be presented to all children as part of a pro-social curriculum. There is certainly a need for appropriate materials to implement such a curriculum.

As important as it is to support on-going efforts to solves the problem of undersocialized, aggressive children, it is equally important to seek out ways to educate and support their parents. Although many parents are aware that their children are not behaving prosocially, many are not aware how far from the norm that behavior deviates. Most have feelings of helplessness and some are in a state of denial. They are, perhaps, more needy than their children.

Programs to raise the consciousness and therefore the effectiveness of these parents are vital to the overall solution.

This practicum has only touched the surface of the problem. Yet, it has experienced positive results. This indicates that any efforts made to ameliorate such a pervasive problem can be fruitful. It suggests that small steps in the right direction can be beneficial to all concerned. It further suggests that not without forethought and planning, but with minimal effort, schools can embark on a mission to promote the socialization of all its students.

DISSEMINATION

The writer intends to share the strategies used in this practicum with colleagues in the field by presenting it at workshops and by submitting the document for publication either in its entirety or in a less formal, revised format. The school intends to promote the program as a unique amenity in its marketing campaigns. As such, it is in this manner that area educators may likely become curious about this practicum. This is not to say that the school will seek to attract undersocialized children, but

rather that it seeks to place a strong emphasis on pro-social behavior.

REFERENCES

Cline, M. (1979, October). On the Development of Social Competence: Position paper.

Cummings, E.M. (1987). Coping with background anger in early childhood. Child Development, 58, 976-984.

Denham, S. (1986). Social cognition, pro-social behavior, and emotion in pre-schoolers: Contextual Validation. Child Development, 57 (1), 194-201.

Eisenberg, N. & Lennon, R. (1987). Emotional displays associated with pre-schoolers' pro-social behavior. Child Development, 58, 982-1000.

Eisenberg, N., Pasternack, J., Cameron, E. & Tryon, K. (1984). The relationship of quantity and mode of pro-social behavior to moral cognitions and social style. Child Development, 55, 1479-1485.

Eisenberg-Berg, N. & Neal C. (1979). Children's moral reasoning about their own spontaneous prosocial behavior. Developmental Psychology, 15, 228-229.

Elardo, R. (1980, May). Values and childrearing in the home and day care center: issues for the 1980s. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, St. Louis, MO.

Elder, J. (1989, Jan. 8). The superbaby burnout syndrome. The New York Times, pp 16-18.

Feeney, S. (1988, January). The aggressive child. Young Children, pp. 48-51.

Field, T.M. & Vega-Lahr, N. (1988). Type A behavior in pre-school children. Child Development, 57, 1333-1348.

Furman, W., Rahe, D. & Hartup, W. (1979). Rehabilitation of socially withdrawn children through mixed age and same age socialization, Child Development, 50, 915-922.

Gray, D. E. (1981, April). The Teacher's Role in Understanding Aggression and Dealing with it Effectively in the Pre-school Environment: Teaching Guide.

Grotberg, E. H. (1977, February). The Role of Parents in Early Childhood Development: Research report.

Honig, A. (1987, November). Socialization and discipline for infants and toddlers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, Chicago, IL.

Kim, Y. & Stevens, J. (1987, February). The socialization of pro-social behavior in children. Childhood Education, pp. 200-205.

Kobak, D. (1981). Teaching children to care. Journal of Children and Youth: Position paper.

Roke, E.J. et al. (1980, April). Parent Variables in Young Children's Cooperative Behavior. Paper presented at the biennial Southeastern Conference on Human Development, Alexandria, Va.

Roopnarine, J. & Honig, A. (1985, September). The unpopular child. Young Children, pp. 59-64.

Schenk, V. & Grusic, J. (1987). A comparison of pro-social behavior of children with or without day care experience. Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 33(2), 231-240.

Slaby, R. & Crowly, C. (1977). Modification of cooperation and aggression through teacher attention to child speech. Journal of Child Psychology, 23, 442-458.

Skolnick, A. (1988). The Psychology of Human Development. Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, San Diego.

Smith, G. (1985). Facial and full-length ratings of attractiveness related to the social interactions of young children. Sex Roles, 12, (3-4), 287-93.

Sparks, A. et al. (1984). Prosocial behaviors of young children related to parental childrearing attitudes. Early Child Development and Care, 15, (4), 291-98.

Stein, A. L. et. al. (1973, May). The Effects of Aggressive and Prosocial Television Programs on the Social Interaction of Preschool Children. Paper presented at the meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.

Zahavi, S. & Asher, S. (1975) The effect of verbal instructions on preschool children's aggressive behavior. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Illinois (Champaign-Urbana).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baumrind, D. (1978). PArental disciplinary patterns and social competence in children. Youth and Society, 9, 239-276.

Denham, S. (1987, August). Child Competence and Maternal Emotion Socialization Correlates of Attachment Q-sort Variables. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, NY.

Elardo, R. (1977). Research: facilitating prosocial behavior. Day Care and Early Education, 5(2), 24-25.

Evans, E. D. (1981, March). Update and Implications of Early Personal-Social Learning. Paper presented at the Annual Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development COnference, St. Louis, MO.

Feeney, S. (1987, November). Ethics Case Studies: The Working Mother. Young Children, pp. 6-11.

Finklestein, N. W. (1982, September). Aggression: Is It Stimulated by Day Care? Young Children, pp. 3-9.

Floody, D. R. (.980, August). An Early Childhood Educator's Guide to Prosocial Development: Position paper.

Foster, C. (1978). Understanding Parents' Valuec for Their Chidren, and Recognizing the Family as a Prime Educator: Arizona HSST/CDA Competency Based Training Module #11. (Available from Arizona/Nevada CDA, PO Box 337, Sacaton, AZ).

Hatch, J. (1987). Peer interaction and the development of social competence. Child Study Journal, 17(3), 168-83.

Honig, A.S. (1982, July). Research in review:prosocial development in children. Young Children, 37(5), 51-62.

Kuhmerker, L. (1987). The antecedents and beginnings of moral behavior. Moral Education Forum, 12(3), 1-14.

La Freniere, P. & Charlesworth, W. (1987). Effects of friendship and dominance status on pre-schoolers resource utilization in a cooperative/competitive situation. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 10(3), 345-358.

MacDonald, K. & Parke, R. D. (1984) Bridging the gap: parent-child play interaction and peer interactive competence. Child Development, 55(4), 1265-77.

Peterson, L., Hartman, D., & Gelfand, D. (1977). Developmental changes in the effects of dependency and reciprocity cues on children's moral judgments and donation rates. Child Development,48, 1331-1339.

Ritchie K. & Johnson, Z. (1986, November). From Scooby-Doo to Skeletor: Evolving Issues in Superhero Play. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Singer, D. G. & Singer, J. L. (1984). Parents as mediators of the child's television environment. Educational Media International, 4, 7-11.

APPENDIX A: PROSOCIAL PROFILE

DEAR STAFF:
BELOW YOU WILL FIND A SHORT BEHAVIORAL PROFILE THAT SHOULD BE COMPLETED FOR EACH CHILD IN YOUR CLASS. PLEASE REFER TO THE KEY BELOW AND CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX FOR EACH OF THE BEHAVIORAL DESCRIPTORS LISTED.

THANK YOU

STUDENT EVALUATION

	A	U	F	S	N	
1. Is friendly and outgoing	!	!	!	!	!	!
2. Follows directions appropriately	!	!	!	!	!	!
3. Joins in group activities	!	!	!	!	!	!
4. Shares toys with friends	!	!	!	!	!	!
5. Helps other students	!	!	!	!	!	!
6. Plays sociably with others	!	!	!	!	!	!
7. Treats others kindly	!	!	!	!	!	!
8. Is patient and waits his turn	!	!	!	!	!	!
9. Appears happy and content	!	!	!	!	!	!
10. Speaks kindly to others	!	!	!	!	!	!

A = ALWAYS
U = USUALLY
F = FREQUENTLY
S = SOMETIMES
N = NEVER

PARENT FACTORS: (ANSWER YES OR NO - YOU MAY ADD COMMENTS)

1. RESPONDS TO REQUESTS SENT ON PROGRESS REPORTS ___ ___
2. INITIATES COMMUNICATION WITH TEACHER ___ ___
3. HAS MET TEACHER AND HAS VISITED CLASSROOM ___ ___
4. SHOWS AFFECTION FOR CHILD IN YOUR PRESENCE ___ ___
5. ATTENDS SCHOOL FUNCTIONS OR CONVEYS REGRETS ___ ___
6. DISPLAYS ANXIETY WITH REGARD TO CHILD ___ ___
7. ASKS FOR PARENTING ADVICE ___ ___
8. APPEARS SECURE IN PARENTING ROLE ___ ___
9. INDICATES THAT QUALITY TIME IS SPENT WITH CHILD ___ ___
10. IS CHALLENGING, HOSTILE, OR DIFFICULT TO DEAL WITH ___ ___

CHILD'S NAME_____
TEACHER_____

APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL SURVEY

AFTER YOU HAVE COMPLETED A QUESTIONNAIRE ON EACH CHILD IN YOUR CLASS, PLEASE LIST BELOW FIVE (5) CHILDREN <u>WHO ARE NOT IN YOUR CLASS</u> WHO DO NOT DISPLAY PRO-SOCIAL SKILLS APPROPRIATE FOR THEIR AGE. THESE CHILDREN WILL MOST LIKELY:

BE OVERLY AGGRESSIVE PHYSICALLY
HAVE SHORT ATTENTION SPANS
DISPLAY INAPPROPRIATE, OVERLY PHYSICAL RESPONSES TO THE TRANSGRESSIONS OF OTHERS
BE UNWILLING TO SHARE
BE UNABLE TO WAIT THEIR TURN
HAVE BELOW AVERAGE RESPECT FOR PROPERTY
HAVE POOR LISTENING SKILLS
DEMONSTRATE A HIGH LEVEL OF NON-COMPLIANCE

INCLUDE ONLY THE NAMES OF CHILDREN WHOM YOU HAVE OBSERVED IN THIS MANNER, DO NOT RESPOND FROM HERESAY. YOUR RESPONSES WILL BE TABULATED WITH THOSE OF OTHER STAFF MEMBERS. THIS SHOULD RESULT IN A GROUP OF CHILDREN WITH WHOM WE WILL BE WORKING THIS YEAR TO FOSTER MORE PRO-SOCIAL SKILLS. PLEASE CONSIDER YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS SERIOUSLY.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

APPENDIX C: ADMINISTRATOR'S OBSERVATION

ADMINISTRATOR'S OBSERVATION CHART

CLASS______________________________

STUDENT (NUMBER)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20

ADMINISTRATOR'S OBSERVATION CHART

CONTINUED

CLASS____________________________

STUDENT (NUMBER)	21	2	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40

ADMINISTRATOR'S OBSERVATION SCORE CALCULATION

CLASS________________________

STUDENT (NUMBER)	# OF AGG SCORES (DIVIDED BY 40)	# OF SOCIAL SCORES (DIVIDED BY 40)	# OF INACTIVE SCORES (DIVIDED BY 40)

APPENDIX D: RANKING OF ADMINISTRATOR'S OBSERVATION

STUDENT RANKING BY PERCENTAGE OF AGGRESSIVE SCORES

10 HIGHEST SCORES IN DESCENDING ORDER

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____

APPENDIX E: VALUES CLARIFICATION SURVEY

File: QSORT
Page 1
Report: A

NUMBER	DESCRIPTION
1	I WANT MY CHILD TO BE HELPFUL AND CONSIDERATE
2	I WANT MY CHILD TO GET ALONG WELL WITH OTHER CHILDREN
3	I WANT MY CHILD TO ACHIEVE AT OR ABOVE GRADE LEVEL
4	I WANT MY CHILD TO BE AN INDEPENDENT LEARNER
5	I WANT MY CHILD TO HAVE GOOD COMMUNICATION SKILLS
6	I WANT MY CHILD TO GET GOOD GRADES IN SCHOOL
7	I WANT MY CHILD TO FIGHT HIS/HER OWN BATTLES
8	I WANT MY CHILD TO BE COMPETITIVE
9	I WANT MY CHILD TO BE ABLE TO DEFEND HIM/HERSELF
10	I WANT MY CHILD TO BE A GOOD STUDENT
11	I WANT MY CHILD TO MAKE FRIENDS WITH CULTURALLY DIFFERENT CHILDREN
12	I WANT MY CHILD TO BE AGGRESSIVE
13	I WANT MY CHILD TO BE IMAGINATIVE
14	I WANT MY CHILD TO GO TO COLLEGE
15	I WANT MY CHILD TO LISTEN TO THEIR ELDERS
16	I WANT MY CHILD TO FIGHT FOR HIS/HER RIGHTS
17	I WANT MY CHILD TO BE OBEDIENT
18	I WANT MY CHILD TO HAVE THE CAPACITY TO LOVE AND CARE FOR OTHERS
19	I WANT MY CHILD TO SHARE
20	I WANT MY CHILD TO HAVE A GOOD SENSE OF VALUES
21	I WANT MY CHILD TO HAVE A GOOD FOUNDATION IN READING AND MATH
22	I WANT MY CHILD TO BE A GOOD PROBLEM SOLVER
23	I WANT MY CHILD TO BE TRUTHFUL
24	I WANT MY CHILD TO HAVE A CODE OF ETHICS
25	I WANT MY CHILD TO BE CURIOUS
26	I WANT MY CHILD TO RECOGNIZE THAT HIS/HER PARENTS ARE THE BOSS
27	I WANT MY CHILD TO DO WHAT HE IS TOLD
28	I WANT MY CHILD TO LISTEN TO THE TEACHER
29	I WANT MY CHILD TO HAVE A SENSE OF RIGHT AND WRONG
30	I WANT MY CHILD TO BE RESPONSIBLE

1. DIVIDE THE STACK INTO THREE (3) PILES WITH TEN (10) CARDS PER PILE. THE **RIGHT-HAND** PILE INDICATES VALUES YOU HOLD MOST **STRONGLY** FOR YOUR CHILD. THE **CENTER** PILE INDICATES THOSE VALUES WHICH ARE **SECOND** IN IMPORTANCE. THE **LLEFT-HAND** PILE WILL INDICATE THE VALUES WHICH ARE THIRD IN IMPORTANCE.
2. FROM THE **RIGHT-HAND** PILE, PULL OUT THREEL VALUES TO WHICH YOU GIVE PRIORITY AND PUT THOSE THREE TO YOUR EXTREME RIGHT. FROM THE **LEFT-HAND** PILE, PULL OUT **THREE** VALUES TO WHICH YOU GIVE THE LOWEST PRIORITY AND PUT THESE THREE TO YOUR EXTREME LEFT.

THERE SHOULD NOW BE FIVE (5) PILES. THE PILE ON THE EXTREME RIGHT HAS THREE (3) CARDS, THE NEXT PILE HAS SEVEN (7), THE MIDDLE PILE HAS TEN (10), THE NEXT PILE HAS SEVEN (7), AND THE EXTREME LEFT PILE HAS THREE (3).

3. EACH PILE IS ASSIGNED A NUMBER - STARTING ON THE LEFT. ALL CARDS IN THE EXTREME LEFT PILE ARE ASSIGNED THE NUMBER 1; THE NEXT PILE -2; THE NEXT PILE - 3; NEXT PILE 4; AND THE EXTREME RIGHT PILE -5.
4. USE THE FOLLOWING CHART TO RECORD THE SCORE FOR EACH VALUE YOU HAVE SORTED.

LOWEST PILE #1	PILE #2	PILE #3	PILE #4	HIGHEST PILE #5
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____	
	_____	_____	_____	
	_____	_____	_____	
		_____		
		_____		
		_____		
		_____		

5. AFTER LISTING THE CARDS ON THE ABOVE CHART, PROCEED TO SCORE THEM ON THE CHART BELOW: EXAMPLE: IF CARD #4 WAS PLACED IN PILE #3, PUT A 3 NEXT TO THE 4 UNDER PROCESSING GOALS ETC. AFTER LISTING ALL THE NUMBERS, TOTAL EACH COLUMN.

PROCESS GOALS	COOPERATION	OBEDIENCE	SUCCESS IN SCHOOL	COMPETITION	ETHICAL VALUES
4-	1-	15 -	3-	7-	20-
5-	2-	17-	8-	8-	23-
13-	11-	26-	10-	9-	24-
22-	18-	27-	14-	12-	29-
25-	19-	28-	21-	16-	30
TOTAL					

NAME (NUMBER)

APPENDIX G: RANKING OF TEACHERS' PROSOCIAL SCORES

TEACHERS' PROSOCIAL SURVEY
SCHOOL-WIDE RANKING OF SCORES

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____

TABLE 1: VALUES CLARIFICATION SCORES

lowest possible score per category - 7
highest possible score per category - 23

STAFF

competition	10.2
obedience	11.9
school success	14.1
process goals	16.9
cooperation	17.7
ethical values	19.3

GROUP 1 PARENTS (AGGRESSIVE CHILDREN)

competition	12.1
process goals	12.5
cooperation	13.1
school success	17.5
obedience	17.8
ethical values	18.1

GROUP 2 PARENTS (SOCIAL CHILDREN)

competition	8.9
obedience	10.1
cooperation	14.3
school success	17.2
ethical values	19.6
process goals	21.4